

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated November 18, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-21 as being unpatentable over Selby, US Patent No. 4,876,738, in view of one or more of Purnadi et al., US Patent No. 6,708,031; Frid et al., US Patent No. 6,560,239; and Dent et al., US Patent No. 6,542,716.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner has attempted to associate different elements of the claim as being made known by a combination of references teaching disparate networks, which the Examiner appears to acknowledge do not modify the other, but allegedly could co-exist after the alleged combination and operate independently, namely the terrestrial based cellular communication system of Selby, US Patent No. 4,876,738, and the satellite based communication system of Dent et al., US Patent No. 6,542,716. However in so doing, the Examiner has ignored the claimed relationship between the communication areas and the corresponding paging groups, which as presently amended is more clearly defined, where no such relationship is present in the alleged combination of references as articulated by the Examiner. Such a rejection fails to make known each and every feature of the claims, and therefore cannot be said to make obvious the same. For example, because the Examiner has failed to allege an association between the new communication area and the paging group, then the combination of references as presently articulated by the Examiner could not make obvious a determination if the new communication area is associated with a different paging group from the paging group associated with the immediately prior communication area, because there is no alleged association to check, and therefore it is not clear how the combination could register in the new communication area regardless as to whether a registration from a prior presence in the new communication area is still retained.

As a result, the combination of references being relied upon by the Examiner can not be said to make known each and every feature of the claims, and therefore the objection as presently articulated and explained, fails to make obvious the claims as suggested. The same distinction is minimally relative to independent claims 1 and 12, and indirectly dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 13, 14 and 16-21, via their dependency upon claims 1 and 12.

Relative to independent claim 11, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, Lawrence, US Patent No. 6,628,935, fails to make known the deletion of information in a context consistent

with the claimed invention. In Lawrence, '935, the deleted information corresponds to an SMS paging message, which is not the same. The Examiner attempts to more broadly interpret the teaching of Lawrence, '935, by alleging that the reference teaches the deletion of unneeded memory records, but fails to show where the reference teaches the deletion of an unneeded memory record of the type, which would include a previously stored registration. In other words the nexus has not been shown, and the Examiner is not allowed to expand the teaching beyond what the reference actually teaches, through the use of creative re-labeling of the elements associated with the actual teaching. As a result, the reference can not be said to make known or obvious each and every feature of claim 11.

In view of the above noted analysis, the presently articulated rejections can not be maintained, and in absence of a valid rejection, the claims should be correspondingly allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: Lawrence J. Chapa
Lawrence J. Chapa
Reg. No. 39,135
Phone (847) 523-0340
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, W4-35Q
Libertyville, IL 60048